

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending and at issue in the application with claims 1 and 24 being independent claims. Claims 1, 24 and 28 are amended. As such, 2 independent claims remain in the application as previously paid for, and 44 total claims remain in the application as previously paid for. This response is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination and the requisite fee of \$810.00. The applicants believe no additional fee is due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the amount enclosed or any additional fees which may be required under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 13-2855. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the remarks below is respectfully requested.

The action rejects claims 1-4, 7-9, 15-18, 23-25, 27-30, 32-35 and 41-43 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Spriggs et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,889,096), and rejects claims 5, 6, 10-14, 20, 21, 31, 36-40 and 44 as unpatentable over Spriggs et al. in view of Kall et al. (U.S. Application Publication 2003/0149608). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections in light of the above amendments and the remarks below.

Each of claims 1-44 recites a remote data viewing system or a method of viewing entity data collected or generated by a plurality of data source applications. The system or method includes a display of a navigational tree and a display view. The navigational tree includes selectable sections specifying different categories of entity data. Entity data associated with a selected section is presented in the display view in a predetermined format, which is a common display format for presenting entity data of each of the sections. Claims 1 and 24 have been amended to clarify that at least some of the data source applications each include a data source display application that presents the entity data in different viewing formats. Claim 28 has been amended to correct a minor informality.

While different data source applications collect or generate entity data, they are typically designed to be used in a process plant to perform very different functions, often associated with a subset of entities within the plant. The data source applications are therefore developed to organize and provide viewing of the entity data in different viewing formats. While the applications may share the data, the use of different viewing formats

complicates efforts to organize the shared data in a manner that presents the data in an organized and easily understood manner. Accordingly, claims 1-44 provide a system and method whereby entity data from different data source applications may be viewed, such that the entity data is organized into a predetermined common format, even though the entity data may be collected and organized in different manners by different data sources, and presented in different viewing formats due to the respective display applications of the data source applications.

Spriggs et al. does not disclose or suggest a display that presents entity data in a predetermined common format, where the entity data is collected or generated by data source applications that include data source display applications that present the entity data in different viewing formats. Although Spriggs et al. discloses a system and method of gathering information from multiple sources and providing a graphical user interface that provides different views of the plant and assets therein, Spriggs et al. does not disclose that the multiple sources (i.e., the data acquisition devices 60 and data collection modules 50) include display applications that present the information in different viewing formats.

In particular, contrary to the assertion of the action, the passages of Spriggs et al. cited in the action do not disclose or suggest that the data acquisition devices 60 or the data collection modules 50 (cited in the action as the recited data source applications) each present the entity data in different formats. The cited passages of Spriggs et al. (column 11, lines 12-21 and 47-53) read as follows:

A portable data collector module, a TDXnet® data collector module (communications processor) manufactured by Bently Nevada Corporation located in Minden, Nev., and an OPC data collector module are specific examples of data collector modules 50 for specific data acquisition devices 60. These modules collect the data via each of the devices known supported protocol and convert it to a standard input that is received by the core data acquisition module 22 for further processing.

...

Referring now to FIG. 4, the data acquisition core module 22 provides a data-conditioning layer between the physical world and both the database module 80 and the display module 100. Uniquely, the data acquisition core 22 includes means for real time interfacing with both the database module 80 and the

display module 100 for providing real time export and real time display of data.

The action specifically refers to “the devices known supported protocol” as disclosing the recited data source applications each presenting the entity data in different formats. However, this phrase is taken out of context. As quoted above, the supported protocol clearly refers to the protocol of the device as used for collecting data (i.e., “modules collect the data via each of the devices known supported protocol”), not presenting data. By contrast, the claims recite that two or more of the plurality of data source applications each includes a data source display application that presents the entity data in different viewing formats.

Although the applicants respectfully disagree with the action’s assertion that the feature of data source applications having their own presentation format was not recited in the claims, in an effort to resolve any ambiguity, the applicants have amended the claims to clarify that two or more of the plurality of data source applications each includes a data source display application that presents the entity data in different viewing formats. Accordingly, while the data acquisition devices 60 of Spriggs et al. may include software applications, and the data collector modules 50 act as an interface to the devices 60 (see column 8, lines 31-42 as cited in the action), it is clear from the above-quoted passage of Spriggs et al. that the data collector modules 50 only collect the data according to the known supported protocol of the data acquisition devices 60. (See column 11, lines 12-21 and 47-53 as cited in the action). Neither the data collector modules 50 nor the data acquisition devices 60 include display applications that present the entity data in different viewing formats. Instead, the only format associated with the data acquisition devices or systems 60 is that of the display module 100 (i.e., the graphical user interface 102), which is the same format used for all of the data acquisition devices. (See column 2, lines 31-42; Figs. 1, 3, 6, 7-14, 17, 18 and 20-27).

Accordingly, it is clear that while Spriggs et al. is concerned with collecting data from devices based on the devices supported protocol, Spriggs et al. is not concerned with, and does not disclose or suggest, display applications of the devices that present the collected data in different viewing formats. As a result, while Spriggs et al. provides a “single unified display environment” (column 2, lines 41-42), Spriggs et al. does not do so on the basis of

Appln. No. 10/801,195
Amdt. Dated November 13, 2007
Reply to Final Official Action dated August 10, 2007 with RCE

entity data from multiple data source applications that each have their own viewing format. As a further result, Spriggs et al. does not address the problem of different viewing formats complicating efforts to organize shared data, much less the solution provided by claims 1-44, which collects data from data source applications that include display source applications that present the entity data in different viewing formats, and is capable of displaying the entity data in a predetermined common format.

Kall et al. also does not disclose or suggest collecting entity data from data source applications that include display applications which present the entity data in different viewing formats, while providing a display application that displays the entity data in a predetermined common format, nor has Kall et al. been cited for this purpose.

The applicants respectfully submit that the amendments and remarks presented herein have placed the application in condition for allowance. As such, independent claims 1 and 24 are believed to be in allowable form. Further, dependent claims 2-23 and 25-44 which are dependent upon the aforementioned independent claims are also submitted to be in allowable form.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims and allowance thereof are respectfully requested. Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form, in an effort to advance this application towards allowance, the examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned at the indicated number.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive
6300 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300

By: _____

Aaron M. Peters
Registration No.: 48,801
Attorney for Applicants

November 13, 2007